LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH R.P.D.

SAN FRANCISCO Quæstor

LABOUR ON THE EVE J. R. Campbell

ACCOMPLICES OF HITLER Dr. Ecer

IRELAND W. H. McCullough

AFRICA IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

SAN FRAN-CISCO

6D

MAY 1945

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXVII. No. 5

CONTENTS

May, 1945

	Page
Notes of the Month—*May Day*, 1945 by R. P. D.	129
San Francisco by QUAESTOR	138
Labour on the Eve by J. R. CAMPBELL	143
Accomplices of Hitler by DR. ECER, *Czechoslovak Representative on the War Crimes Commission*	146
Ireland by W. H. MCCULLOUGH	150
Africa in the Post-War World—*a Manifesto*	154
Book Reviews—	
A Text-book on Money by M. H. DOBB	156
Scotland by WM. GALLACHER, M.P.	158
Co-operative Evangelist-Critic by R. G. GOSLING	158
Marxism a Guide to Action by T. A. JACKSON	160
Shorter Notice by P.A.	160

A STIMULATING LETTER

Last week of April, when the Fund (see page iii of cover) had fallen steeply, we received this heartening letter, which must surely stimulate other readers:—

" Comrades,

"When I left school (I had to do so since my father was unemployed) I became an errand boy in a Co-op grocery. It was there that I contacted a young man who so influenced my thinking that I shall never forget him. He told me of the great things taking place in the U.S.S.R. and how it had all come about. I was inclined to doubt his word at first, although I very much wanted to believe that the people in so vast a country were in control of affairs.

"More money was offered at an iron foundry near my home, so I found myself employment there. The work was very strenuous, but I had to keep going, as my wages were very much needed. At lunch time, as I sat around the fire outside the works, I listened intently to the shop steward. He, too, spoke of the Soviet Union; when he did so, his eyes were simply lit up with emotion. Inside me the spark of enlightenment was kindling. My aching muscles ceased to trouble me as his words fell on my ears. My ideas were hazy, but they were taking shape. This man was a moulder in more than one sense.

"Later I became an apprentice silver engraver. The journeyman immediately struck me as being a man of special mould. He was the finest craftsman in the place, and as I later learned, a Marxist. No doubts existed in my mind now as to the truth of my grocer comrade's utterances. Life began to have real meaning for me. I wanted to see realised in my own country what Lenin and his associates had accomplished.

"Came the war; I found myself in uniform. In this conflict many of us have experienced much that is frightful to think of. It has been worth it, though, because out of this hell has arisen the required unity of the workers of the world which alone can prevent further wars and lay the foundations of post-war prosperity for *all*.

Continued on page iii. of cover

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

May Day, 1945

MAY DAY, 1945, will be forever remembered as the May Day of victory over fascism. Twelve years have passed since Hitler polluted May Day with the slave parade of his Labour Front over Germany. Nine years have passed since Hitler's war began with the invasion of Spain. Seven years have passed since the Tories of Munich sped to their German Mecca to bless the regime of the Buchenwald torture camps as the harbinger of a new civilisation and the guarantee of peace. Five years have passed since the Nazi legions of brigandage swept over an undefended and betrayed Europe. Four years have passed since Nazism, drunk with success, launched its supreme crusade against the land of socialism. Now the tables are turned. Twelve years of fascism have brought Germany to the depth of catastrophe. Mussolini's "gospel of the twentieth century" lies in the dust, hated, despised and condemned by all. Across oceans of blood humanity has won through. A new world opens.

Eve of Victory

Victory is not yet complete. But its completion draws within view. Each day brings the further advance of the allied armies, the collapse and surrender of more Nazi divisions, the fall of citadels of Nazism, the opening of the gates of prison-houses of torture and murder, the liberation of slaves drawn in millions from all over Europe. The ascent from the depth is not easy; Europe is stricken, maimed, devastated, drained of the lifeblood of its youngest and best; enemies still lurk and plot and manoeuvre to bring back the empire of darkness. But the peoples are awakened and stirring with the confidence of victory, the elixir of a new hope, the sense of their own strength, and the determination to win a new future.

Europe, what of the night? . . .
I feel not the red rains fall,
Hear not the tempest at all . . .
Night, with the woes that it wore,
Night is over and done.

Whatever the measure and degree and time of the fighting still to be faced, whatever the shoals and pitfalls and traps to be circumvented in safeguarding the gains won and winning the peace, the great historical fact of the victory of the democratic alliance over fascism now stands unmistakable and irreversible. From this great consequences flow for the future.

Roosevelt's Memory

In the hour of close approaching victory a shadow was cast over the camp of the peoples by the death of Franklin Roosevelt. It is doubtful if any statesman of the past two decades has been so universally mourned by the people of every country on the day of his death. His loss was felt as a heavy and personal loss by the common man and woman of every country in the world. Nor was this judgment at fault. The share of Roosevelt in shaping and building and maintaining the alliance of the United Nations for the defeat of fascist aggression, in the great accords of Teheran and the Crimea, and in laying the foundations of international organisation for peace, assure his place in world history. Despite all the criticisms of the supercilious and fault-finding of the trouble-makers, popular opinion has universally sensed and responded to the significance of the alliance of the three powers, Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union, leading the partnership of the United Nations, as the sheet-anchor of security for the future.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Popular opinion has no less felt, and justly felt, the significance of the personal part played by the three outstanding representatives of the three nations, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, through their breadth of vision and political insight overriding the barriers of prejudice and reaching these firm accords. Hence the sense of loss with the passing of Roosevelt. If we may accept Plechanov's definition of a great man:

A great man is great because he possesses qualities which make him most capable of serving the great social needs of his time, needs which arose as a result of general and particular causes.

by that test Roosevelt was indubitably great in one of the most searching tests of history and in the hour of the world's need.

President Truman

But the practical lesson from that loss must be the strengthening of the alliance. The fight for the unity, the stability and the endurance of the alliance needs to be drawn the closer, because we know how much the petty intriguers and disrupters and isolationists will hope to see their opportunity with a new holder of the presidential office, not yet as tried and widely known or with the same prestige and authority as his predecessor, to push through their wrecking schemes. The strength of the alliance is based on enduring common interests, and does not depend for its existence on the fate of individuals. President Truman's first actions and his first address to Congress have dealt a blow to the calculations of the intriguers. His first action within an hour of taking office was to confirm the date of holding the San Francisco Conference, thereby scotching the ill-judged campaign for postponement; and to send the message to Marshal Stalin, which met an immediate response with the decision of Molotov's journey to Washington and San Francisco.

Continuity of Foreign Policy

His first address placed in the forefront the aim of complete victory:—

America will never become a party to any plan for partial victory. . . . Our demand has been, and it remains, unconditional surrender. We will not traffic with the breakers of the peace on the terms of the peace. . . . Nothing shall shake our determination to punish the war criminals, even though we must pursue them to the ends of the earth.

Equally it affirmed the aim of international co-operation, both for the maintenance of enduring peace and for close economic co-operation on the basis of expanding production and the raising of social standards throughout the world:—

We must now learn to live with other nations for our mutual good. We must learn to trade more with other nations so that there may be for our mutual advantage increased production, increased employment and better standards of living throughout the world.

The programme of the United Nations, embodying the policies for which Roosevelt fought, goes forward.

Lloyd George

Only a few weeks before the death of Roosevelt, the death of Lloyd George in his eighty-third year called to mind a past age of British politics. Contrasts and analogies of the careers of Roosevelt and Lloyd George have been widely drawn; but the contrast is greater than the analogy. Sprung from dissimilar origins, both came to the forefront in the earlier phase of their governmental careers in the midst of a period of social storm and stress, which they sought to meet by measures of legislative reform and social and economic innovations, which in fact served to salvage the old structure, but brought on their heads the objurgations of the wealthy and the privileged. Both became war leaders in the world wars of our era. But here the analogy breaks. Roosevelt, the patrician, the child of fortune, reached in his final

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phase a position of strength, of unequalled opportunity in the far more advanced world situation of our day, and of political insight to respond to that opportunity, which enabled him to become the instrument of history for the advance of the cause of the peoples against reaction. Lloyd George, sprung from the common people, with a profound instinct to the last for the feeling of the common people and endowed with a rare combination of gifts, of political insight and of vitality which could have enabled him to become a tribune of the people, and which made him, in fact, the foremost figure of British politics in the first two decades of the twentieth century and the indispensable war leader to whom the weakening ruling class had to turn in the crisis of the first world war, became the instrument of that ruling class for its predatory aims, only to be flung aside, still at the height of his powers, when he had served their purpose.

Routine and Realism

It was, indeed, characteristic of the period of deep decay of the old society in Britain between the two wars that during those last twenty-three years of Lloyd George's life, the ruling class could make no use of his towering abilities, indefatigable energies, vitality, experience and sagacity, but preferred the blind and impotent conventional routinism of a Bonar Law, a Baldwin, a MacDonald and a Neville Chamberlain, just as in the culminating years before the war they equally excluded Churchill. Lloyd George combined with his outstanding gifts an uncanny realism which made many of his judgments, as Lenin noted, closer to the outlook of Marxist analysis than in the case of any other non-Marxist statesman, though, in sharp distinction from Marxism, that realism was accompanied by an absence of any clear or firm guiding principle and consequent boundless opportunism. During those closing years of enforced political inactivity some of his judgments, especially in relation to the international situation in the final phase of the onset of the war and during the first phase of the war, bore a penetrating character which either influenced events at the time or have had subsequent vindication.

Words for Remembrance

It is worth recalling today his words in the first week of the present war, which have been less often recalled in the obituary notices, and which placed in the forefront the consequences and the responsibility for the refusal of the Anglo-Soviet Alliance:—

> We must not conceal from ourselves the enormous difference it would have made to our chance at this hour if two powerful Russian armies were advancing. This was the plan placed before our military mission by Voroshilov, the Soviet War Minister. The tragic story of the rejection of the plan has still to be told, and the responsibility for the stupidities that lost us Russia's powerful support justly affixed and sternly dealt with.
>
> —(D. Lloyd George, in the *Sunday Express*, September 10, 1939.)

"*And sternly dealt with.*" The time for that stern dealing is coming with the approaching general election. It is also worth recalling what he wrote on Poland in September, 1939:—

> It is a notorious fact that the Polish peasantry are living in great poverty owing to the worst feudal system in Europe. That aristocracy has been practically in power for years. All the promises of concessions to the peasants have been thwarted by its influence on recent Polish Governments. That is why the advancing Russian troops are being hailed by the peasants as deliverers.
>
> —(D. Lloyd George, letter to Polish Ambassador, September 29, 1939.)

He would have been the first to welcome the liberation of the Polish peasants and the land reforms under the leadership of the Polish Provisional Government today.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irresponsible Manoeuvres

As the war speeds towards its victorious conclusion in Europe, it is more than ever essential to be on guard against last-minute manoeuvres which seek to distract public attention from the main task or rob the peoples of the full fruits of victory. Such was the transparent and irresponsible electioneering manoeuvre which suddenly filled the entire press of this country on the eve of Easter with inspired announcements, not from military correspondents, but from the *political correspondents* in every case, that the Government was about to declare "V Day" within a few hours or days on the basis of the successful advance in the West. The folly of these announcements, which bore no relation to public opinion or service opinion, recalled the similar outbreak last autumn, when on the basis of the unopposed advance over France, predictions were freely spread from minor Ministers and small-fry official sources (including those responsible for the housing plans) that the war would be over in a few weeks, or at latest by Christmas. This time the offence was more serious, because it was no longer merely a case of a foolish amateur military judgment, but of a would-be smart electioneering trick from familiar wirepulling sources (comparable to those which spread "No War This Year" in 1939), completely indifferent to the tasks of the fight against fascism and solely intent on subordinating the war to the calculations of a snap election. It will cost this country dear if these wirepullers in the Tory machine were able to resume their control of affairs, as in their halcyon days under Chamberlain, now that they think the war danger is removed and they can get back to their old tricks.

Forgetting the War

At a time when countries and peoples from Norway and Holland to Czechoslovakia and Northern Italy are still bleeding under Nazism, when British and allied soldiers are having to face heavy fighting and death in the final battles, it was indecent for these wirepullers to suggest that the completion of victory in Europe could be proclaimed for the convenience of an unscrupulous electoral calculation. But it was also stupid, since a moment's thought should have made clear to these cheapjacks that the decision to proclaim the end of the war in Europe and outlaw the remaining Nazi forces can only be taken as the joint decision of the Allied Commanders and Governments, at such moment as they judge suitable in the interests of victory, and not to suit the convenience of the internal political situation in one country.

General Eisenhower's Warning

It was left to the old Munichite organ, the *Observer*, to endeavour to get round this difficulty by going to the length of announcing that the end could be proclaimed for Western Europe separately:—

> The war situation is such that the end of organised resistance on the Western Front may be announced in the very near future. It may even be announced this week-end.
>
> It is known that news of first-class importance reached Ministers in Downing Street yesterday, and high officials who are rarely to be found in their offices on Saturday were on duty all day yesterday.
>
> —(*Observer*, April 15.)

Similarly the old Munichite organ, the *Daily Telegraph*, next day:—

> The opinion is growing that, if circumstances compel it, a general announcement may be made in anticipation of Mr. Churchill's war statement, due on Thursday. Declaration of victory in Europe will be accompanied by an ultimatum to all Nazi leaders and Luftwaffe and German naval commanders who are still holding out.
>
> —(*Daily Telegraph*, April 16.)

The cool suggestion that V Day might be proclaimed separately for the West

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(even there excluding Norway and Holland) stank too powerfully of the separate peace angled for by the Nazis to be further pursued. General Eisenhower immediately dealt the quietus to this pernicious rubbish by his firm statement issued on April 16:—

> There will be no announcement of V Day until all important enemy pockets have been cleared out.

Next day Churchill announced the postponement of his war statement, and on April 19 explained to questioners:—

> I have no announcement to make about VE Day at the present time, except that I deprecate premature speculations upon the subject. The matter is not one we could settle by ourselves. This is not a matter which rests wholly with us.

Thus ended an unpleasant episode which cast a lurid light on the character of the wirepullers in the Tory machine and provides a warning to the electorate.

Last Lap Dangers

Last laps are proverbially dangerous. In the war against fascism, where military and political factors are completely intermingled, this is especially important. What would have been the consequence if a premature declaration of the end of the war in Europe, unjustified by the military situation, had been made at Easter, or immediately after Easter, as desired by the Tory wirepullers? Such a step would have exactly played the Nazi game. As Alexandrov pointed out in his article in *Pravda* on the same date, the Nazis had moved 44 divisions from the already weaker West to the Eastern Front, where their overwhelming main forces were already concentrated, not for purely military reasons, but precisely in order "to cause dissension among the Allies" and "to gain by a military and political trick that which they failed to gain by force of arms." Thereby the effect was created of opening the front in the West, of the end of resistance in the West, to spread illusions among Western opinion that the war was over. The Munichite electioneers walked straight into the trap.

Completing the Victory

Had they had their way, the effect would have been to create complete confusion and bewilderment of public opinion, the jubilation of a handful, distraction of the main attention to domestic issues and the electoral contest; and then the painful awakening to the fact that the war in Europe was not over, that troublesome and possibly prolonged fighting was still involved in a series of sectors, with a consequent revulsion of feeling through the previous illusory hopes and desire to be quit of it on any convenient rapid basis. We cannot leave out of mind the only previous example of the method of one-sided proclamation of the end of a war, in the case of the South African War, where the declared principle of unconditional surrender was carried out in the shape of a one-sided proclamation of the end of the war in 1900, only to be followed by two years of fighting, which ended in a negotiated settlement. Hence the importance of General Eisenhower's firm declaration that all the important enemy pockets must first be cleared before the end of the war in Europe can be declared.

Nazi Strategy

Nazi military-political strategy in this final phase of the war is unmistakable. They have not concentrated their dwindling forces into a single fortress or Southern Redoubt, as some commentators predicted. Instead, they have scattered them over a series of positions of varying strength over Europe. From a purely military point of view this might appear a suicidal strategy to guarantee the maximum destruction of German forces. But from a political standpoint it is less unintelligible. None of these positions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could remain ultimately tenable against the superior strength of the allies; but many could maintain resistance over a certain period and require a cost to reduce, at a time when the main phase of the war has been won and the peoples are looking for peace. If they can hope by this means to maintain for a period their points of warfare and resistance (not merely over Germany, but over Europe), to organise their armed bands and fifth column, to take advantage of all the conditions of destruction, devastation, confusion and internal difficulties in the European countries, to take advantage of war-weariness of the victors, and to take advantage of any weakening of the bonds of the alliance after victory through diplomatic divergences and the manoeuvres of reactionary sections, this represents their last hope and best hope for their future come-back. As General Faupel, the organiser of the Ibero-American Institute for Nazi penetration in South America as their future world base, has recently been spreading the slogan, to counter the effects of the manifest military defeat: "Germany may lose a war, but she never loses a peace." This is the final strategy of Nazism which it is necessary to defeat, both by the firm unity of the alliance in the critical coming period, by the terms of peace imposed on Germany, as agreed at Crimea, and by the measures to destroy every basis of armed Nazi resistance and fascist formations throughout Europe.

Baited Traps

Despite every rebuff, it is obvious that German reaction still courts the West and hopes to find friends. There is obviously no hope for the Nazi leaders. But the big monopolists, industrialists and Junker lords, the real backers, creators and paymasters of Nazism, now come forward in person and offer themselves to the kind attention of the Western allies. Like sitting rabbits, they await discovery in the path of the Anglo-American armies. First, the looted gold of the Reichsbank is revealed, together with a leading Reichsbank director at hand to explain that they did not blow up the mine, because they wished the Americans to find the gold, so that it could serve as the basis for the future Reichsmark. Next, Alfred Krupp, head and sole owner of the 160 million mark Krupp concern, appears in immaculate attire in the path of the allied armies to explain that his one philanthropic thought is to maintain employment for his beloved workers (and 50,000 foreign slaves). Next, von Schnitzler, chief of the Chemical Combine, allows himself to be discovered, and exclaims: "Gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be working with you again." He explains that he looks forward to visiting "his friends the Duponts" and "several other people in the United States and Britain—all heads of big industrial concerns—whom he described as intimate friends" (the *Daily Telegraph* of April 13, which reports this charming scene, naturally does not print the names of the British "intimate friends"; but the intelligent reader can fill in the gap). Finally, is revealed the King Pin himself, old Von Papen, the arch-plotter of German imperialist intrigue for thirty years, and the kingmaker who placed Nazism in power. He is apparently received with all the diplomatic courtesy due to his high position and distinguished record, and the Government professes itself unable to determine whether there is any reason to regard him as a war criminal. For good measure, the Kaiser's son, Auwi, the Nazi, also joins the happy throng.

Von Papen Explains

In this connection it is of interest to note the declaration of the United States Assistant Secretary of State, J. C. Holmes, in a recent broadcast:—

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In August, 1943, von Papen told a close friend that Germany could no longer hope to win the war, and so every possible move should be made to save German industry and military power for the future.

In November, 1943, a representative of the German concern, I.G. Farbenindustrie (the Chemical Combine) assured certain business officials that whether Germany won the war or not the firm's position in a certain market area would not be impaired—because pre-war cartel agreements with certain firms would probably be renewed.

Lord McGowan may possibly be able to throw further light on this. Unfortunately, the Government has so far refused the demand for a public enquiry into the operations of monopolies and cartels in this country; and very little publicity has been given to the American official reports and prosecutions now pending, which include leading British firms in the indictment to be brought before their courts.

War Criminals

All these real Big Shots of the criminal Nazi regime, the multi-millionaire Krupps and von Schnitzlers and von Papens and the rest, who thus appear dramatically from behind the scenes when the crisis arrives, evidently imagine that they have discovered a much more ingenious method than the stereotyped false beard and forged passport to skip to Switzerland or South America. With the simplicity of genius, and not forgetting the precedents of Hess and Prince Paul, they have decided to present themselves in the undisguised distinction of their own personalities to the British and American military commanders, confident that they only need to mention their highly placed connections and that they can leave their "friends" to do the rest. It is for the British and American public to determine whether this transparent strategem is to be allowed to come off. These men are war criminals, as heavily responsible for every criminal action of the blood-stained Nazi regime as the Hitlers, Himmlers, Goebbels and other Nazi riff-raff whom they subsidised, backed and placed in power. Attention is called to the important article on this matter appearing in the current issue by Dr. B. Ecer, of the War Crimes Commission.

Bait-Swallowers

Unfortunately, crude as these manoeuvres might appear, there are certain sections in this country and the United States which are prepared to assist them; and certain quarters which have always displayed their readiness to swallow this kind of bait and are now displaying it again. The *Daily Mail* used to print on top of its front page for years after the last war: "They will fool you yet, those Junkers." Quite right; and the *Daily Mail* was the first to be fooled, with its ecstatic pages of admiration for Hitler and Nazism, adoring special interviews, and solemn dedication to the service of Hitler's blackshirt agent in Britain. Now again the *Daily Mail* comes out with hostility to Crimea and San Francisco and dubs the latter "San Fiasco," which slogan is immediately taken up and repeated daily by Haw Haw and Nazi propaganda. Similarly the *Daily Herald* Foreign Editor, apparently yearning back to the good old days when the *Daily Herald* supported Hitler's armed occupation of the Rhineland, which was the decisive starting-point of the present war, and denounced the proposal for a British-French-Soviet alliance against fascist aggression as warmongering, pours scorn on the "talk in some quarters" (i.e., in United Nations quarters and the Crimea Agreement) "about the possibility of future German aggression. . . . Why all this harping on about the menace of Germany? . . . Who can say where the next Hitler or Napoleon or Frederick the Great or Genghiz Khan or Attila

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is coming from?'' (April 4.) Already? Before even the victory is won.

San Francisco

It is in the light of this situation, of near approaching dearly-won victory of the United Nations over fascism, but of the certainty of new manoeuvres of fascism and reaction to revive, to undermine the victory and to incubate new war, that the significance of the San Francisco Conference must be seen. In the moment of victory, in the exultation of liberation, in the midst of the glorious prospects opening out on this May Day, we must never lose sight of the enemy, and of the need to complete and consolidate the victory which is being won. The strengthening of the unity of the alliance of democratic nations, the fulfilment of the Crimea decisions and the establishment of the world organisation for the maintenance of peace, as planned and agreed at Dumbarton Oaks and the Crimea—this is the policy which will prevent the repetition of the years following 1918.

United Power for Peace

The problem of world peace is not primarily a problem of juridical formulas; it is a problem of united power for the maintenance of peace. The benevolent and woolly-minded old gentlemen who expound their sapient criticisms of the Dumbarton Oaks and Crimea plan in formalistic terms, and fail to see this plain fact, are as capable of leading mankind in the present crisis as a new-born infant in a jungle. The essential conception of the plan to be placed before the San Francisco Conference for adoption is that the same overwhelming combined power of the United Nations which has defeated fascism, and which, had it been earlier in existence, could have prevented the fascist war, must now be carried forward after victory to maintain peace. Success of this depends entirely on the unity of the Great Powers, and primarily of Great Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union. Maintenance of this unity depends, not on formulas, but on politics, on the unbreakable determination and unity of the three peoples to carry forward this co-operation. It is only on this foundation that the plan for world organisation takes on its practical character.

Towards the Election

It is equally in the light of this situation, and of the understanding of our responsibility within it, that we need to approach the problems of the coming general election. The coming election cannot repeat pre-war political alignments, as if the war had been an irrelevant interruption. The entire united strength of the British people will be needed for the new tasks following victory, to complete that victory, to complete the war in the Far East, to carry through and maintain the terms of settlement in relation to Germany, to establish the world organisation for peace and international economic co-operation, and within this framework to initiate the great social and economic changes within Britain which are now imperative and within our grasp. It would be a grave danger to these aims if the electoral verdict were to be confused and disorganised, not owing to any lack of enthusiastic desire of the majority of electors for these aims, but solely owing to the inability of the progressive parties and organisations representing them to reach agreement. When we press with increasing urgency the necessity of Labour and progressive unity in the election, it is not merely as an indispensable electoral mechanism to ensure the defeat of those worst representatives of reaction who are entrenched in the present Tory majority, and who would endanger the fulfilment of these aims. It is, above all, with the positive purpose of building up that united progressive

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leadership, based on a united labour movement and its allies, which can rally the entire nation for the fulfilment of these aims and establish a new type of Government of National Unity for their fulfilment.

Labour Election Statement

The newly-issued Labour Party statement of policy for the election could provide the basis for establishing the common programme of such an alliance. In its final section, the "Call to all Progressives," this statement at last recognises the necessity of unity of all progressives in the election, Liberal, Labour, Communist, Common Wealth, etc. (not named, but referred to as "Liberals" and "the smaller parties"), if Toryism is to be defeated and not to secure as previously a parliamentary majority on a minority vote. The dilemma is frankly stated. No concrete step whatever for a solution is as yet offered. Instead, the ingenuous piece of wishful thinking is expressed that, if only the members and supporters of other parties would vote for Labour, there would be no problem. No doubt. If the Labour Party had accepted the affiliation of the Communist Party, there would be no problem in that respect either. But the first elementary rule of politics is to deal with facts as they are. A united vote of the members and supporters of various organisations is desired. Good. How is that to be achieved? How on earth can it be achieved except by agreement between the organisations concerned? To refuse the means is to refuse the goal. And to refuse the goal is to play into the hands of Toryism. The warning signal of the Motherwell by-election, as well as the positive indication of the Scottish Universities by-election, should give pause to those who consider that a Labour majority may be regarded as automatic without need of an alliance. There is still time—but very little time now—to reverse this negative policy, to allow discussion of the issue at the Whitsun Labour Party Conference, and to establish that Labour and progressive alliance which is the key to victory at the election and to the future for Britain.

R. P. D.

April 21, 1945.

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES; United Kingdom, 12 *months* 7*s. Postage paid. Abroad,* 8*s. Two weeks' notice is required for change of address.*

A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3/- *a year inclusive of postage.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

San Francisco

by QUAESTOR

A FEW dates are necessary to begin with. On October 10, 1944, the press of the United Nations published the "tentative proposals for the establishment of a general international organisation under the title of the United Nations," which had been adopted at Anglo-Soviet-American-Chinese conversations held at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, U.S.A. On February 13, 1945, the same press published the communique of the Crimea Conference between Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill, announcing that agreement had been reached on a question left open at Dumbarton Oaks—namely, voting in the proposed Security Council—and that a conference of United Nations would be called at San Francisco on April 25, 1945, "to prepare the Charter of such an organisation along lines proposed in the informal conversation at Dumbarton Oaks." On March 5, 1945, the text of the proposed agreement on the voting procedure was published. It provided that, while a majority of any seven out of the eleven members of the Security Council could take decisions on any other question, decisions involving common action against the aggressor would require the unanimous support of the five Great Powers, permanent members of the Council—China, France, the United Kingdom, U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.—as well as of at least two of the other members.

If we look over the discussion of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in Britain since they were first published, its development falls into two main stages. In the first, the principal features of the proposed new organisation came under attack. The very idea that an all inclusive international body was possible and necessary had to be defended against the champions of a "western bloc"—of Britain, France and other West European countries against the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. But the fact that the Governments of the three Great Powers themselves stood firmly by the new scheme had in reality knocked the bottom out of the "Western bloc"; and its advocates soon changed their ground. It was the "dictatorship of the Great Powers" which they challenged—as exemplified in the provision of permanent seats for the Big Five in the Security Council; in the compulsion on members of the United Nations to apply sanctions to the aggressor at the bidding of the Security Council; in the sole right of the latter to decide on action against the aggressor; and in the necessity that the Big Five should agree to any amendments of the United Nations Charter adopted by a two-thirds majority in the Assembly, before the amendment could become valid.

However, this stage of the discussion did not arouse very bitter controversy. The lessons of the failure of the League were too fresh and painful. It was only too clear that the failure was due above all to the lack of unanimity of the Great Powers, and only in a secondary degree to the constitutional defects of the League of Nations Covenant. With regard to the needs for ratification of amendments by the Great Powers, it was obvious that, as the Foreign Office Commentary put it, "they have the major responsibility in the question of maintaining international peace and security, and could hardly be expected to undertake to carry out this duty under conditions not agreed to by themselves." As for the general principle, the homely argument put up by Mr. Eden, in his speech at Leamington on November 15, 1944, could not seriously be confuted:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There may be some who say that that means a Great Power dictation. It means no such thing. There is nothing I would welcome more than the collaboration and help of all peace-loving States, large or small. But we must be realistic and the truth is that, unless the Great Powers can work together, the foundations of peace are not there. If they can work together, there is no problem, however difficult, they cannot resolve. Supposing that before this war we four had been in close harmony and agreement, the Germans would never have been able to launch their offensive against the world; and if we are together afterwards they will never be able to start this business again.

The real attacks on the draft Charter began only in March, after the publication of the agreement reached at the Crimea Conference on the question of voting in the Security Council where action against aggressors is concerned. This was only natural.

The formula adopted brings home for good—at any rate for many years to come—the *joint responsibility* of the five great Allies for preventing a future disaster. Thereby it underlined before all the nations of the world the solidarity of interest of the two main systems of society now in existence—Socialist and capitalist—in maintaining peace against the Powers interested in war—Germany and Japan. This could not be pleasing to the inveterate anti-Soviet elements, the pro-Nazis and the near-Fascists, who are still to be found in this country as in others.

The Crimea formula, furthermore, for the first time in any international instrument since Lenin's "Imperialism" was written, publicly underlined the *primary and inalienable* responsibility of the Great Powers—with their enormous resources in man-power, natural wealth, basic industries, finance and armaments—for maintaining world peace and eliminating the political, economic and social causes of war. Thereby it threw a vivid and revealing light on the true nature of modern international relations. This could not be pleasing to various schools of muddle-headed or pacifist thought in Britain which seek refuge from reality in so-called "idealism" about those relations—whether because they shrink from the truth about the British Empire in particular, or because they fear the logic of dispassionate investigation into the causes of war in general.

The Crimea formula also gave great displeasure to a small section of irresponsible politicians who exist within the labour movement, and who share some characteristics of both the above camps, drawing their arguments from either indiscriminately, according to the prevailing situation—now pro-Soviet, now pro-Nazi, sometimes preaching Liberal pacifism, at other times shouting ultra-revolutionary sentiments — but always glorifying themselves at the price of still further befogging the less advanced workers, upon whose continued bewilderment they rely for their own continued existence.

The discussion of the Crimea voting proposals during March and April, 1945, provided many examples of all three schools.

The *Daily Mail*, to take one example, even before the formal publication of the voting proposals, had declared that "a paper solution has been found which will in no-wise protect a small nation from aggression by a big Power—the only sort of aggression we meet in this 'enlightened' age" (February 20). This from the *Daily Mail*—which hysterically approved Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia and the German-Italian overthrow of Republican Spain, condoned the Nazi occupation of Austria, and spared no aspersion upon Czechoslovakia when Hitler and Chamberlain between them contrived its downfall! With all the indignant virtue of a brothel-keeper who

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teaches Sunday School, it denounced (March 13) the published proposals as "the unrestricted licence of cartel and monopoly power in international politics," explaining that small Powers "do not start wars of aggression unless they are backed by big Powers," and that the League failed because it was decided that article 16 of its Covenant, involving measures to stop or punish aggression, "could safely be ignored by larger countries." If there was one newspaper in this country in the years 1935-39 and one political group of decisive influence for whom it spoke (and speaks) who resisted the application of article 16 against aggressor Great Powers, it was the *Daily Mail* and the Chamberlainite majority of the Parliamentary Tories! On April 10 the *Daily Mail* proclaimed the voting arrangements to be "little more than a Dumbarton hoax on credulous peace-loving people all over the world," on the ground (after much open and insinuated abuse of the U.S.S.R.) that "no system can be firm which is not based on universal respect for international law and morality." The cloven hoof, so characteristic of the *Daily Mail* in the days when it threw open its columns to the British Nazi Sir Oswald Mosley (1935), when its Special Correspondent at Nuremberg Nazi Congresses was on good terms with fuehrers and gauleiters (1936-38), and when it shed tears over Hess on his arrival here (1941), showed itself once more in the reflection that, if the voting proposals are accepted, "we can find little justification for protesting against those who see bloody and inhumane wars as nothing but the logical continuation to extreme lengths of legitimate politics." In plain English, this means that if Britain and U.S.A. continue to stand together with the U.S.S.R. to guide the world in peace as in war, the Nazis are justified in waging their ferocious and savage war.

More subtle, but no less revolting is the argument of the other principal mouthpiece of Tory anti-Soviet opposition—the *Observer*. Just as though its owners at Cliveden had never radiated "Anglo-German fellowship" with the Nazis, during the years when Hitler was preparing war on the world, just as though it had campaigned itself for sanctions in defence of Austria and Czechoslovakia, Spain and China, we find it writing (March 11) that the voting proposals "are a demand on the part of the Biggest Powers that they, like the barons of old, should be outside or above the law. They can legally apply sanctions to the unruly; but sanctions may not legally be applied to them, if they determine to go their own way." Like the *Daily Mail*, Lord Astor's paper is seriously concerned about "the only cases of aggression which are ever likely to trouble seriously the peace of the world; aggression by a Great Power, or aggression by a small one which can count on a Great Power's support." Like the *Daily Mail*, it sheds tears over the "illusion of safety" which the old League of Nations created—omitting to mention that whenever one of the cases of aggression occurred after Hitler came to power, the *Observer* always took the side of the aggressor, by opposing the full exercise of power against him, which Britain, France, the U.S.S.R. and many other States could have deployed through the League of Nations.

And with the *Observer*, too, the cloven hoof peeps out again and again —in its eager snapping up of every bit of anti-Soviet garbage supplied by the Polish reactionaries in London; and in its assertion (April 8) that the non-fraternisation order to Allied troops in Germany is a mistake ("most of the common German people, while they feel themselves at one with their Army, feel themselves so divorced from the S.S. that they have more in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

common with invading Britons''), and that millions of Germans ought not to be sent for reconstruction work in the ravaged countries, when there are German houses and factories to be rebuilt, German fields to be cultivated (''it would be no advantage to turn Germany into a kind of rural slum'').

After the nauseating sham of the Chamberlainites, it is a relief to turn to the second group of critics, of whom at least it can be said that many of them (like Lord Cecil, Gilbert Murray and others) struggled very hard for collective support by the Great Powers of the victims of fascist aggression in the years before 1939. This does not extend to all of them—for example, the *Economist* (April 7) which made the question of voting the peg for an article full of malicious innuendoes about the alleged ''reluctance with which Russia seems to be joining the world organisation,'' and even suggesting that the U.S.S.R. will withdraw from the organisation owing to differences with the U.S.A. on this question.

Characteristically, the *Economist*, in which Catholic and Polish influences are active, views this possibility quite complacently. Large conferences without preliminary agreement are ''fruitless'' anyway; in Europe ''no great harm is likely to be done''; in fact, the only complication might be for President Roosevelt personally (this was, of course, before his death). The link between hostility to the Crimea agreement and world chaos could hardly be displayed more clearly.

However, Sir William Beveridge (now head of the Liberal Party's election organisation) had a good try—all the more because he, too, was not distinguished before 1939 by any outstanding championship of collective security against Nazi-Fascist aggression. In a letter to *The Times* (March 7), after lamenting that the five Great Powers were putting themselves above the law, he declared: ''The inevitable result of this will be that the small Powers must seek security in alliances or dependence on one or other of the Great Powers. That, with spheres of influence, balance of power, competitive armaments and the rest of the old bag of tricks, is the short way to a third world war.''

It is quite obvious that Sir William is under the delusion (on which he also feeds at length in a new book, *The Price of Peace*) that there is a rule of law in international affairs existing somewhere outside the will of the Great Powers—a fantastic travesty of history. It is equally obvious that he imagines that the small Powers, if some other document were signed at San Francisco, could avoid seeking security by alliance or dependence on one of the Great Powers—an equal fantasy. And he ignores the whole trend of developments between the Moscow Conference in October, 1943, and the Crimea Conference this year —which shows, on the contrary, that Britain, America and the Soviet Union are strong enough to liquidate, or at least intermingle, spheres of influence as between themselves, to replace balance of power by planned collaboration, and competitive armaments by planned reduction of armaments.

In the House of Commons debate on April 17, Sir William went the whole hog, and demonstrated how the logic of his seemingly high-principled position comes in reality from a purely parochial outlook, reflects anti-Soviet prejudice which he has previously displayed and leads in practice to complete anarchy. In this speech he made it plain that, in his view, only Britain and the U.S.A. were serious in combating aggression, and that the danger of aggression came (among others) from the U.S.S.R.—a grotesque picture, when we remember what action the respective Powers took in the years 1933-39. Rather than accept the principle of primary and joint responsibility of the Great

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Powers, "he was not sure that it would not be better to have no world organisation."

Well might Colonel Elliot comment that Sir William's argument was "muddle-headedness, and of a dangerous kind because it was linked with the highest motives. It was such muddle-headedness which brought States, nations and causes to ruin."

It must be noted in fairness that, in the course of their criticism, the Liberals and pacifists put forward some practical proposals for secondary improvements in the Dumbarton Oaks text—for example, that there should be a declaration of humane principles and aims at the beginning of the Charter, and that there should be great emphasis on the international organisation of economics, cultural and social co-operation between nations. Some of these proposals have been taken up by various delegations to the San Francisco conference. But the central and main issue at which this school of thought boggled was throughout the discussion that of voting in the Security Council. Even the *News-Chronicle* itself—a supporter of collective security in the pre-war years, and of Anglo-Soviet-American co-operation today—wobbled violently at one moment, actually proposing that the conference should be postponed.

In the labour movement as a whole, which last year adopted two far-reaching and entirely realistic statements of international policy (at the T.U.C. and the Labour Party Conference) there was no such violent rocking of the boat. It is only among the elements of the third type mentioned earlier that echoes could be heard of the criticism in the Tory and Liberal camps. Such, for example, was the comment of Mr. Rhys Davies in the House of Commons (March 1) that, if Eden was right in saying that no Great Power in Europe should be allowed to challenge the liberty of the European peoples, then "the next generation of people in this country have got to be prepared for a war on Russia." Such also was the sneer of a Roman Catholic Labour M.P., Mr. Ivor Thomas (April 17), that, if the Crimea agreement were adopted, "all we should have achieved was a debating society." Here he was joined by the very left Mr. Michael Foot in the *Daily Herald*, with his sneer at "the platitudes likely to be approved at San Francisco" (April 13). Mr. Foot had already shown his leftness earlier (March 2) by drawing a crushing contrast—to justify his constant attacks on the U.S.S.R. for supporting the Polish Provisional Government—between the "opportunist British Premier" who signed the Crimea Agreement, and the imaginary alternative (which he drew before the dazzled eyes of the Soviet Union) of "genuine co-operation" with a "Socialist Britain giving democratic leadership to Europe and the world."

But there is no Socialist Britain today, nor yet a Socialist U.S.A. or a Socialist Europe. There are three very Great Powers, far stronger than any ever existing before in history; and only one of them is Socialist. There are two others, temporarily much weaker, but of immense potential strength. All five are not interested in aggression, and the interests of all five of them lie, truly understood, in the peaceful development of democracy. They have been fighting this most terrible of wars in ever closer alliance. Aggression during the last generation has come not from them, but from German imperialism, its satellites and allies. The new world organisation is being built, and can only be built, upon the presumption that the smaller nations have nothing to fear from the victorious Great Powers, and on the contrary, can hope for security only to the extent that those Powers become closer and closer friends. As *The*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Times wrote truly on April 12 (without touching, as indeed, it could not be expected to touch, on the economic and social foundations of modern society):

Any "rule of law" is necessarily rooted in the political order on which it rests, and cannot live in isolation from it. The initial task which has been undertaken at Dumbarton Oaks and at Yalta is the creation of an international political order; and out of it, if it can be successfully established and maintained, the international rule of law will grow by a slow process of evolution. Nothing is more dangerous than to suppose that it can be created in full stature by a deliberate act. From this point of view the fact that the veto of the Great Powers places them theoretically "above the law" is of small account. At the present stage of international development there is no way of making them effectively subject to it; and as the whole Geneva experience has proved, pretence in international affairs is one of the worst enemies of progress. The capacity of words to confuse thought and obscure facts has rarely been better illustrated than the argument which, explicitly or implicitly, has crept into print again and again in the past few weeks, that Great Powers are more or less likely to commit acts of aggression according to whether certain words are or are not written into a constitutional document. The retention of a veto on certain ultimate decisions—and this alone is in question—is not evidence of a will to aggression. Recourse to warlike measures against a Great Power would itself demonstrate that the foundation of consent on which the whole system rests had been irretrievably destroyed. If no stable political order can be created by process of compromise, adjustment and agreement between these agglomerations of power, then even the present beginnings of an international rule of law will quickly wither away. If such an order can be established, then these beginnings can be developed by slow degrees into a more solid and comprehensive structure, which will provide valuable reinforcement to the political machinery for the building of peace.

On the success of the efforts now being made at San Francisco to build a world structure of security—above all, to apply in practice and extend the principle of peaceful co-existence between the Socialist Great Power and the capitalist Great Powers, whatever the further solution of their internal social, political and national problems—depends the very continuance of civilised life, let alone the creation of a stable international political order.

Labour on the Eve

by J. R. CAMPBELL

THE Labour Party Conference, meeting this month at Blackpool, will put the finishing touches to the party's General Election programme and strategy.

That election will be fought after the war with Germany is over. It will then be clear to the most thoughtless that gigantic problems will face the British people. A Europe devastated beyond all imagination will await reconstruction, major British industries face the need for a root and branch reorganisation, the nations united in the fight against fascism have to develop world economic co-operation and lay the foundations of a powerful security organisation. The British people will be in a serious mood. Those who approach the election with an apparatus of time-honoured electoral tricks may get surprisingly short shrift from the new electorate. We are sure that a majority of conference delegates will appreciate this fact.

No surprises are likely to emerge in relation to the party programme, which has already been formulated piecemeal by previous conferences.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Executive Committee is likely, however, to present a resolution which will outline the essential measures on which the party will fight the election. The nationalisation of heavy industry, the armament industries and building which figured in a resolution adopted by last year's conference will be quickly dropped in favour of a more modest one, confining itself to demands for the over-all control of the economic system and the public ownership of coal, steel and transport.

In foreign policy the party will be called upon to define its attitude to the Crimea agreement. Will it give this agreement its unequivocal support or will it adopt a niggling, naggling attitude towards it? Judging from previous conferences there will be no difficulty in heavily defeating those pacifist amendments which are more concerned with finding excuses for the German people, than they are with the restoration of the countries which have been over-run, looted and destroyed by the Nazis.

More dangerous, however, will be the amendments which seek to weaken the agreement in relation to the world security organisation.

The proposed composition of the Security Council of the organisation will be attacked on the ground that it constitutes "a dictatorship of the Big Three." There could be no better illustration of the pacifist claptrap which permeates a great deal of Labour thinking on foreign politics today. The unreal danger of Britain, U.S.A. and the Soviet Union tyrannising over the world is passionately attacked, oblivious of the difficulties which have still to be overcome before the full co-operation of the great powers in a world security organisation can be secured.

If the Labour Party desires to win public confidence it will reject the sorry quibbling of those who want to undermine the great agreement between Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin, which points the way forward to world peace.

On election strategy the conference is faced with the necessity of giving a more realistic answer to Churchill's electoral plan than has emerged in the speeches of Labour leaders up to the present. It is not enough to say that the proposal for a National Government after the war is purely a Tory trick. It is true, of course, that the Tory Party prefers to sail under national colours rather than under its own. But why does it prefer to do so?

Irrespective of the element of election tactics embodied in Mr. Churchill's proposals, it is true that great post-war problems like the peace settlement, international co-operation, and the reorganisation of British industry, can most effectively be tackled on the basis of a broad agreement as to ways and means to which all the leading parties subscribe, and that a new National Government should be formed on the basis of such an agreement. In these circumstances it is folly to leave the national flag to be exploited by the Tories. Surely the proper way to face up to the problem is to announce that if Labour is returned as the strongest party it will form a new National Government in which the Labour and progressive forces will predominate. No one knows better than the Labour leaders that enormous problems, transcending those of the aftermath of the last war, will confront the British people. Yet a section of old-fashioned Labour men, like the old-fashioned Tories, have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. The old Tories believe that we can speedily "return to normal" life after the war, so let us lift the controls and get back to the old unrestricted scramble for profits. The old-fashioned Labour man says that we will soon get back to normal, so let us return as soon as possible to the pre-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war party fight which should, as far as possible, be conducted on the familiar pre-war party issues. Why can't the Labour leaders say clearly that on a whole series of major issues, a period of all party co-operation will be necessary if the speediest and best result is to be maintained?

It is simply no argument to engage in a long recital of the sins of the Tory-dominated coalition. Have the Tories some peculiar, hereditary genius for dominating coalitions? Is it not possible to achieve such a relation of parliamentary and class forces as will create the possibility of a coalition under Labour leadership?

Many Labour leaders would like to postpone such questions until after the General Election. On the other hand, some local Labour Parties want the conference categorically to declare (1) That the Labour Party shall not form a government unless it has an absolute parliamentary majority; (2) that the government shall be a pure Labour government and (3) that on no account shall Labour take part in a coalition. The Executive will doubtless strive to get the discussion of the whole issue postponed. If this is supported a disastrous impression of wavering will be created in the public mind.

More ghastly still is the refusal of the Executive to consider entering into relations with other progressive forces with a view to electoral unity at the next election. The fruits of such a policy are to be seen in the victory of the Scottish Nationalist candidate over Labour at the Motherwell by-election. This vote follows too closely on the large vote for the Scottish Nationalist candidate at the Kirkcaldy by-election to be dismissed entirely as a freak result. True, the Scottish Nationalist Party has a large selection of eloquent political freaks. But great masses of Scots people remember the terrible economic depression in the country between the wars and are more and more turning to believe that a measure of self-government for Scotland would be helpful. The shopkeepers and middle class professional people are beginning to give a favourable reception to nationalist ideas. How did the Labour Party react in Motherwell? Speakers are put up who do not confine themselves to exposing the more absurd proposals of the nationalists, but who make harmful attacks on the Scots national feelings. In a terrifyingly ignorant and cold-blooded fashion a section of the Scots middle class is driven away from the labour movement. Not only so, but the division in the working-class ranks is maintained. The largest single meeting in the campaign was one organised by the Communist Party, which was campaigning for the Labour candidates. The reply of the Labour Party was to insert an advertisement in the local press repudiating all such unauthorised meetings and threatening their organisers with prosecution. Strip away the local peculiarities and you will find that a similar policy is being pursued by the Labour Party in most constituencies in Britain. The middle class is driven away and the split in the working-class movement is perpetuated.

The conference will have the last chance before the General Election of reversing this disastrous policy. Important unions, like the Amalgamated Engineering Union, have sent in resolutions asking the Executive to meet other progressive organisations with a view to discussing electoral unity at the election. These resolutions express the will of the mass membership of those great working-class organisations. Yet both the Conference Arrangements Committee and the Executive Committee have applied a three years rule which declares that because this question was discussed in 1944 it must not be discussed until 1947. This

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is just smart conference rigging. The delegates have only to glance at their agendas to see that the rigid application of this rule would eliminate two-thirds of the resolutions on the agenda. In point of fact, the three years' rule is only applied to questions the Executive would like to suppress.

If the conference succeeds in forcing a discussion on this vital issue, we hope it will not be fobbed off with bluster and irrelevances. The great majority of responsible delegates will understand that there is no hope of a Labour and progressive majority unless a whole host of suburban and semi-rural constituencies are wrested from the grip of the Tories. This is only possible if the working-class is united in the great majorities of the constituencies and is able to establish good relations with the middle strata of society.

Electoral unity is the only policy before the labour movement which can attain these objectives. To reject it is to hand over favourable positions to the Tories before the battle has started. We are hopeful that the conference will avoid this tragic blunder.

Accomplices of Hitler

The criminal responsibility of the German Financial and Industrial Leaders according to the Soviet Criminal Law.

by Dr. B. ECER

*Barrister, Chairman of the Society for Economic and Cultural Relations with the U.S.S.R. in Brno (Czechoslovakia), and Czechoslovak Representative on the United Nations War Crimes Commission**

THE criminal guilt of the German financial and industrial magnates for having helped Hitler and his gang to prepare and launch the second world war and for having helped him to plunder the invaded countries are, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the subject matter of very careful examinations by the "Extraordinary State Commission for Ascertaining and Investigating Crimes of the German-Fascist Invaders" and of numerous articles written by Soviet legal experts with Professor Trainin at the head.† They deal with the problem on the lines of the Soviet criminal law.

The Soviet legal experts rightly point out that the Nazi gangsters (i.e., Hitler, his Government, German militarists, and leaders of the Nazi Party) would have been unable to commit their biggest crimes against humanity by launching the second world war or to commit unprecedented atrocities in the course of this war without having "a social basis." This "social basis" is to be found in the powerful German financial and industrial concerns.

The part played by German financial and industrial concerns in the rearmament of Germany for the second world war and in its preparation and launching, is in some quarters intentionally under-rated. The reason is obvious: the German financial and industrial magnates, whose names are well-known throughout the world,

* Author of *The Lessons of the Kharkov Trial* (Russia Today Pamphlet, 2*d*, 1944).

† For instance: Trainin: "The Criminal Responsibility of the Hitlerites," Moscow, July, 1944 (in Russian only).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

re-armed Germany with money supplied to Germany by the allied banks.

But these German magnates did not content themselves with what they called "revival of German economy," and what was, in fact, German rearmament. They paid fantastic sums of money to Hitler and his Nazi Party before 1939. By massive financial subsidies they saved the Nazi Party from collapse, signs of which had appeared at the end of 1932, and, in full knowledge of the criminal Nazi plans and aims, they did their utmost to put the Nazi gangsters into power in 1933. In this they were helped by the Prussian landlords. And finally they organised during the war the plunder and enslavement of the invaded peoples.

The criminal plans and aims of Nazism were never concealed. As far as the Soviet Union was concerned, they were stated by Hitler himself with frank brutality. The criminal intention to murder, plunder, steal and rob in the Soviet Union, Hitler frankly and publicly announced, and admitted in his speech to the Nuremburg party gathering on September 13, 1936:—

If I had the Ural mountains with their incalculable store of raw materials; Siberia with its vast forests; or the Ukraine with its tremendous wheat fields, Germany under National Socialism would be swimming in plenty.

Six years later, in a wireless speech in October, 1942, Goebbels confirmed these war aims of the German Nazis, stating:—

This time more important things are at stake which concern us all, coal, iron, oil and above all, wheat, so as to ensure that we have our daily bread on our table.

The Minister of Agriculture, Darré, in a speech delivered in 1940 to Nazi officials (the speech was not reported in the German press, but reproduced by the British press on May 27, 1944) completed the statements of Hitler and Goebbels as follows:—

It will then be our duty to organise economically the territories gained, which gradually will be included in the German area. We will introduce in our new "living space" completely new methods.

All soil and industrial property of inhabitants of non-German origin will be confiscated without exception, and distributed primarily among the worthy members of the party and soldiers who were accorded honours for bravery in this war.

Thus a new aristocracy of German masters (Herrenvolk) will be created. This aristocracy will have slaves assigned to it, these slaves to be their property and consist of landless, non-German nationals.

Please do not interpret the words "slaves" as a parable or as a rhetorical term. We actually have in mind a modern form of medieval slavery which we must and will introduce because we urgently need it in order to fulfil our tasks.

These slaves will by no means be denied the blessings of illiteracy; higher education will in future be reserved only for the German population of Europe.

International law of course forbids such crimes. Germany signed the Hague Convention of 1907, Article 52 of which forbids requisitions in kind and service except for the needs of the army of occupation.

On September 25, 1926, the famous Slavery Convention was signed in Geneva, also binding Germany. In the preamble of this Convention the signatory States stressed that it is necessary to prevent forced labour from developing into conditions analogous to slavery. In 1930 the Forced Labour Convention was concluded, forbidding forced or compulsory labour in all its forms. But what validity has international law for the Nazis? Let me quote Hitler on this point. According to Rauschning, Hitler said:—

I shall shrink from nothing. No so-called international law, no agreements, will prevent me from making use of any advantage that offers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany acted exactly on the lines set up by Hitler and Darré. The most terrible regime was established in the territories of the Soviet Union occupied by the Germans.

In the Soviet pamphlet, *Hitler's Slave Traffic in Occupied Soviet Areas*, issued with a covering note by M. Molotov in April, 1943, it is stated that Sauckel sent the following instructions to his officials in the eastern areas on March 31, 1942:—

The recruitment for which you are responsible must be speeded up—by all possible means, including the most severe application of the principle of forced labour.

Again on April 20, he circulated a secret programme of "Chief Administrator for the Utilisation of Man-Power," containing the following passages:—

In addition to the war prisoners already taken and still in the occupied regions, it is chiefly necessary to mobilise in the Soviet regions the civilian skilled men and women workers over fifteen years of age to be used for work in Germany.

In the "Tasks" section of the same document Sauckel said:—

In order to free from their work the very much occupied German peasantry, the Fuehrer has instructed me to deliver to Germany 400,000-500,000 picked healthy, strong girls from the eastern regions.

The civil administration of the eastern territories was placed under the authority of a special minister responsible direct to Hitler. This outstanding criminal was Alfred Rosenberg, the famous "philosopher" of Nazism. He controlled two so-called Reich Commissariats, Ostland under the Reich Commissioner Lohse and Ukraine under Erich Koch. Both are the worst type of Nazi criminals.

The Red Army captured some documents illustrating how this banditry planned by Hitler, his political gangsters and economic bandits the German financial and industrial magnates, was carried out. *The Soviet War News* of April 30, 1942, reports:—

". . . . Red Army troops captured the original of a secret document issued by the "Reichsmarschal of the German Empire" Goering, and titled "Instructions for Directing the Economy of Newly Occupied Eastern Regions" (Green File). This secret document of 28 pages, consisting of several sections and numerous paragraphs, was issued with the publication mark "Berlin, June, 1941."

The instructions of Hitler's Government were published, as is evident from the text of the document, directly before Germany's attack on the Soviet Union and were designed for "orientation of the Military Leadership and Military Economic Organs in Economic Tasks in the Eastern Regions which are to be occupied." These instructions ("Green File") give the following definition of the most important purposes of the German attack on the U.S.S.R.:—

In accordance with the orders of the Fuehrer, it is necessary to take all measures for immediate and full utilisation of the occupied regions in the interests of Germany. To obtain for Germany as much food and oil as possible—this is the main economic purpose of the campaign. Along with this, German industry must be supplied also with other raw materials from the occupied regions. The first task is to ensure within the shortest possible time the complete supply of the German troops with food at the expense of the occupied regions.

The document contains the following cynical observations:—

Absolutely inappropriate is the opinion that the occupied regions must be put into order as soon as possible and their economy restored. Order must be restored only in these regions, where we can obtain considerable reserves of agricultural products and oil. As to the rest—economic activities must be limited to the utilisation of stocks found there. (Front Section "Main Economic Tasks," paragraphs 1 and 2.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the realisation of this predatory plan, which also provides for the organisation of compulsory labour in towns and villages, the issue of currency without any backing, and the abolition of wages, a special apparatus was set up, described in detail in the said document. This apparatus represented, as it were, a separate arm of the German army with its own "Economic Command," "Economic H.Q.2," "Intelligence Service," "Inspectorate," "Military Units," "Detachments for collection of Raw Materials," "Military Agronomists" and "Agricultural Officers."

Orders issued by the German military commanders of the Kursk and Orel districts were captured by the Red Army after the liberation. In these the inhabitants are ordered to hand over to the German commanders under the penalty of death, all their property, food stock included without any exception.

It is impossible to indicate the extent of these crimes committed by the Germans in the Soviet Republics, the value of the plundered property and the number of Soviet citizens exterminated or made into prisoners of war. The figures, if ever established, will probably surpass the most fantastic imagination. The reports of the Soviet Extraordinary Commission published up to date contain only a fraction of them.

The question arises now: "*What law is to be applied to the acts of the German financial and industrial magnates?*" The Soviet legal experts approach this problem on the lines of the Soviet criminal law—in strict accordance with the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943, that German criminals would be tried according to the laws of the liberated countries where the crimes were committed. Each Soviet Republic has its own criminal code. The general provisions of all these codes are the same. Among them there are provisions concerning perpetrators and accomplices, which are identical with the corresponding provisions of other modern criminal law. But in addition, the Soviet criminal codes have one special provision which appears in the criminal codes of only a few Allied nations. *It is the provision concerning the so-called "crime of banditry."*

A clear picture of the crime of banditry was given by the Public Prosecutor in the trial against the Trotskyists, Vyshynski, at present deputy to the Foreign Minister, Molotov.

According to Vyshynski's conception, *every member of a criminal band who, knowing the criminal purpose of the gang, joined it, is responsible for all crimes committed by the gang because in advance he agreed to the crimes to be committed and by his membership he helped the gang to carry out its criminal purposes. It is absolutely indifferent whether one part of the gang is operating in one town and the other part in another town. All are responsible for every crime committed by the gang.*

This is not greatly different in practical results from the treatment by English courts of criminal operations carried on by groups of people in conspiracy.

The Soviet legal experts admit that perpetration, complicity and banditry with regard to the ordinary crimes committed in peace-time are not so complicated as in the cases of what they call "international crimes"; for these international crimes are committed by a complicated State apparatus consisting of innumerable branches, so that the mutual relation between the members of the criminal band on the one hand and the relation between them and their criminal deeds on the other hand, is not so clear and obvious. *But this only means that the criminal activity of such men is more dangerous.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I sum up as follows:—

The German industrial and financial leaders are personally and criminally responsible:

(*a*) As accomplices—"aiders and abettors"—of Hitler, his Government and High Command, for the preparation and the launching of the second world war; and, within this general crime against the whole of humanity, for the aggression against and the invasion of the Soviet Union;

(*b*) As accomplices of the political and military Nazi gangsters for the unprecedented atrocities committed against the Soviet prisoners of war and the peaceful population of the invaded Soviet Republics;

(*c*) as organisers — perpetrators — of the gigantic plunder and robbery systematically planned, prepared and carried out in the invaded Soviet territory, and for the slave trade with Soviet man-power. The Yalta declaration promised the *quick punishment of ALL German war criminals* —thus of the industrial and financial bandits as well.

Ireland

by W. H. McCULLOUGH

WITH Northern Ireland in the war and* Eire neutral, Britain has a problem of first rate importance right on her doorstep, and one which cannot be ignored. This problem is also of deep concern to the people of Ireland, particularly the Labour and other progressive forces throughout the country who desire to see both parts of Ireland aligned with world democracy and playing a part in realising the Crimea Conference decisions.

It must not be forgotten that Britain had a major responsibility in creating the present anomalous position in Ireland. A glance into the comparatively recent history of the relations between Britain and Ireland will perhaps assist in giving a better understanding of the present situation.

By the Act for the Union of Great Britain and Ireland (January, 1801) the United Kingdom was formed, with a single Parliament. From that date the fight for Home Rule for Ireland commenced. Various legislative proposals for changes in the system of Irish government were put forward, from Mr. Gladstone's Bills of 1886 and 1893 to Mr. Asquith's Government of Ireland Bill of 1912.

Finally, after years of bitter struggles, including the 1916 Rebellion, the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, was passed. Under this Act the present two Governments of Ireland emerged.

The birth of the two Governments was not without terrible sufferings on the part of the Irish people and much heart-searching on the part of the people of Britain—and it left a running sore between the peoples of the two countries

Today Eire, to all intents and purposes, is free from British rule, that is, as free as any country can be that still is bound by financial and trading ties. Its Government has complete control over both external and internal policies. The fact that Eire has declared for neutrality in the war and Britain has respected her right to do so, amply demonstrates the relationship between Britain and Eire in this respect.

The position of Northern Ireland is entirely different. Its constitutional

* Eire literally means the whole of Ireland. But since the De Valera government decided to use this name it has come to denote the twenty-six counties of Ireland over which the De Valera government has jurisdiction. Northern Ireland is really the six counties of north-east Ulster over which the Stormont government has jurisdiction.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position is complete separation from Eire, on a well-defined border (with custom officials lined along the border as between different countries on the continent of Europe) and very close links with Britain, Northern Ireland is represented by thirteen members of Parliament in the British House of Commons.

The Government of Northern Ireland has limited powers only. In external affairs its policy is the policy of the British Government; and British foreign policy cannot even be discussed in the Northern Ireland House of Commons. Under the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, customs and excise duties, income tax (including super tax) and any taxes on profits, are levied by the British Government and paid into the United Kingdom Exchequer. Outside of these reserved taxes, the Northern Ireland Government has power to impose and collect taxes for the benefit of the local Exchequer, "but with the specific limitation that it may not impose a general levy on capital."

Northern Ireland each year makes a financial contribution (the Imperial Contribution) to Britain. In 1923 the Colwyn Committee, appointed by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Baldwin) advised that "The extent to which the total revenue exceeds the actual and necessary expenditure in Northern Ireland shall be taken as the basic sum for determining the contribution . . ." while this "actual and necessary expenditure" should provide "an average standard of local service equal to the average standard obtaining at the same time in Great Britain." The Imperial Contribution, collected by British authorities and paid into the British Exchequer, has varied from year to year.

Although the Eire Government has changed hands—from the Fine Gael Party to Mr. De Valera's Party, Fianna Fail—the Northern Ireland Government has not. Using the constitutional position as the main plank of its programme, and playing on the fears of the Protestant majority of the people on the danger of being incorporated in Catholic Eire, the Unionist Party has, for a quarter of a century, retained its position of authority despite a record which would have condemned any Government in any country to political oblivion.

Between the wars Northern Ireland's main industries—agriculture, linen and shipbuilding—degenerated to almost stagnation; unemployment was as prevalent as in the worst of the depressed areas of Britain. In all but name Northern Ireland was a depressed area. Despite the provisions of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, social services were not maintained at the same level as Britain's.

Criticism is directed against Eire for its present admittedly unsatisfactory relationship with world democracy; but, while it is the desire of all democrats to see Eire allied to the democracies, a heavy responsibility rests with reactionary Tories both in Britain and in Northern Ireland for the present position.

While it is necessary that the people of Britain should give more sympathetic attention to the question of Ireland, particularly with the view of strengthening world democracy by the inclusion of Eire in the "world family," the main responsibility rests with the Labour and progressive forces of Northern Ireland. Theirs will be the task of first of all stopping the gap between the two parts of the country and starting a movement in the other direction; and, secondly, to make Northern Ireland a help instead of a hindrance in the fight for the realisation of the Crimea decisions. Theirs will be the task at the next general election of sending to the British House of Commons representatives who will play a different role

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the Savorys, Littles and O'Neills. And most certainly theirs will be the task of tackling and overcoming Northern Ireland's home problems.

In Belfast, the capital of Northern Ireland, political activity is increasing in preparation for the forthcoming general elections. Unionist, Labour and Communist Parties have already held their annual conferences, and their respective programmes are now before the people. The Nationalists, not organised as a political party and split three ways on policy, have not as yet announced what their programme is, other than that, generally speaking, they are against the Government.

While the Labour Party officially has rejected unity with the Communist Party, there is little antagonism between the two. The Transport and General Workers Union practically controls the policy of the Labour Party; if the policy of this union in Britain is altered on the question of unity of the labour movement, then unity would be achieved almost at once in Northern Ireland.

Even now the possibility of united action by the two parties for the general elections is very bright.

The Communist Party is campaigning strongly to win the people in support of its programme and here is a summary of the main points of its programme:

(i) The utmost co-operation with the people of Britain and democratic peoples throughout the world in support of the Crimea decisions; Northern Ireland to play a full part in the war effort until Japan is defeated; the people of Northern Ireland to maintain the closest possible connection with the people of Britain and to march abreast with them to rid the world of fascism, and to march abreast with them for social progress;

(ii) friendly relations between the governments of Eire and Northern Ireland and for co-operation between the two governments and the people of both parts of Ireland on questions of mutual interest; Eire to come into the world family of democratic nations;

(iii) removal of all restrictions that prevent the people of Northern Ireland living a democratic life;

(iv) a united labour movement and the election of representatives of the labour movement to the Houses of Commons, Westminster and Stormont, and to local authorities;

(v) nationalisation of the transport system of Northern Ireland; the electrification and development of its industries; greater government control of the aircraft, linen and shipbuilding industries; full employment;

(vi) an extensive building programme; provision of modern amenities—light, heat, running water, lavatories, etc.—to the people of the rural areas of Northern Ireland; government assistance to agriculture—subsidies, seeds, drainage, etc.—and the raising of the standard of living of farm workers and the ending of the "tied cottage" system.

The Unionist Party, through its leading speakers, made clear that the main point of their programme for the general elections would be the constitutional position: in other words, they were going to fight the elections, not on the question of Northern Ireland playing a part with democratic countries throughout the world in making the peace enduring, not on immediate social questions, but on the "Border" issue.

Already Unionist Party speakers are hammering at this question, which has stood them well in the past.

But as a weapon of propaganda the "Border" is wearing a little bit thin. And the time is fast approaching, maybe has arrived, when the value of the "Border" bogey will be very doubtful. The reason is: the issue of the "Border" has been removed from practical politics and the people to an increasing extent are realising this.

It is for this reason that the Communist Party has definitely stated that it will not advocate any change in Northern Ireland's constitutional posi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion; that it is convinced that within the present political and economic framework, and under the provisions of the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, the people of Northern Ireland have sufficient scope to develop along democratic lines, more so now than ever because of the great possibility that the next government in Britain will be the most democratic in the history of the British people.

It is not by raising slogans either for or against the "Border" that the people of Northern Ireland will travel along the road which will lead to a satisfactory solution of home problems or problems that affect relations with Eire, but by resolutely facing up to the present concrete situation and acting in accordance.

Nor will the people of Britain assist to realise their objectives by ignoring the fact that Ireland exists and is Britain's closest neighbour. Nor will the people of Britain help their own cause by treating Eire as a neutral which will have to be dealt with by strong arm methods.

Firstly, the people of Britain must bear in mind that their ruling class of the past helped to create the present situation; secondly, although neutrality is the Government's official policy, the people of Eire have and still are contributing to a great extent to the Allies' war effort—tens of thousands are in the British armed forces, tens of thousands are doing valuable war work in factories and fields, over 90 per cent. of Eire's trade is with Britain, and she has played no small part in feeding the people of Britain.

Eire's neutrality is not the neutrality of Spain, neither is her past record the record of Spain. The people of Eire have strong democratic traditions; if these have weakened, which is doubtful, during the past few years, it has been because of the course of events.

Recriminations on the part of the people of Britain could easily be reciprocated by the people of Eire. But this is not the way forward. The way forward is for the people of Britain to correctly estimate the present situation, particularly in the light of the Crimea decisions, and to start a move now that will win Eire to the world family of democratic nations.

OLD BOUND VOLUMES

Enquiries often come to the office for the older volumes of the LABOUR MONTHLY. Of the years set forth below, there are a few copies still available at the prices mentioned:—

1927	£1	10	0	each
1928	£1	10	0	each
1932	£1	5	0	each
1935	£1	1	0	each
1937	£1	1	0	each
1941		15	0	each
1942		15	0	each
1943		15	0	each
1944		11	0	each

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa in the Post-war World

MANIFESTO
FOR PRESENTATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE, SAN FRANCISCO, APRIL, 1945

Promulgated and supported by The League of Coloured Peoples in co-operation with West African Students' Union (London), International African Service Bureau (London), Negro Association (Manchester), Negro Welfare Centre (Liverpool and Manchester), Coloured Men's Institute (East London), and endorsed by the following Colonial Trades Union Leaders on behalf of their unions:

J. S. Annan, Gold Coast Trade Unions.
T. A. Bankole, President, Nigerian T.U.C.
H. N. Critchlow, British Guiana Trade Unions.
J. A. Garba-Jahumpa, Secretary, Gambia T.U.C.

THE decisions of the historic Crimea Conference represent the consolidation of the alliance of the three great powers, Great Britain, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the final phase of the war of liberation against Hitlerite Germany. They demonstrate the unity and singleness of purpose of the anti-fascist powers to "destroy German militarism and Nazism and to ensure that Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world." The decisions aim also at the prevention of any future aggression and at the removal of the political, economic and social causes of war with the close and continuing collaboration of all peace-loving peoples.

By their Declaration the leaders of the three Governments have reaffirmed their faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, their pledge in the Declaration by the United Nations and their determination to build in co-operation with other peace-loving nations a world order dedicated to a secure and lasting peace which will "afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

The dawn of a new epoch in world relations is thus breaking. Only on the basis of the unity of purpose and of action which has made victory in the war possible for the United Nations can the highest aspiration of humanity—a secure and lasting peace—be realised.

Establishment of an International Organisation.

The decision regarding the establishment of an International Organisation confirms and consolidates the decisions of the United Nations already reached at Teheran, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, and Hot Springs to provide the framework of future world security and prosperity. The problems of mankind are now recognised as the concern of the entire world.

Over large areas of the world millions of people live in poverty, disease, squalor and ignorance. Their continued low standards of life constitute a serious threat to the standards of people everywhere and represent a powerful challenge to the financial and technological resources of the more advanced nations joined together in collaboration to promote world prosperity and the happiness of mankind.

The vast continent of Africa with its 160 million inhabitants and immense though undeveloped resources in mineral, forest and agricultural wealth must command the attention of the international organisation. The rapid economic development, industrialisation and the advancement of the social standards of Africa must

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form an integral part of any plan to build world prosperity.

United Nations must free themselves of the evils against which they are fighting.

Africa is a land of varied political forms, economic interests and social and cultural standards. This is complicated by the fact that among the powers with imperial possessions in Africa are fascist Spain and fascist Portugal. It is further complicated by the colour-bar laws and practices obtaining within the territories of some of the United Nations themselves, notably the Union of South Africa. The United Nations are pledged to secure in addition to the military defeat of fascism, the eradication of its moral and political manifestations, chief of which is the theory of the master race against inferior races. If the principles for which we fight do not apply only to Europe, then it is the duty of the United Nations to eliminate the influence of the Spanish and Portuguese fascist regimes and to remove from their own territories those theories and practices for the destruction of which Africans have died on many battlefields. In this way alone can true international collaboration and planning for the future of Africa proceed in conditions free from conflict and favourable to such collaboration.

Recommendations.

In the belief that it is the eager desire of the United Nations to begin with the least possible delay the solution of these problems, we recommend:

(1) That the International Organisation should immediately adopt policies and set up all necessary machinery to secure the uniform and rapid development of the economic, social and cultural life of the African peoples.

(2) That guided by the principle of equal rights for all men and recognising that the success of any scheme will depend on the measure to which Africans themselves participate, steps should be taken for the provision of maximum opportunity for such participation at all levels of administration.

The present inferior political, economic and social status of the African peoples militates against the achievement of harmonious co-operation among the peoples of the world. International co-operation demands the abolition of every kind of discrimination on account of colour, race and creed wherever such discrimination exists.

(3) The present system of exploitation by which the bulk of the wealth produced in Africa goes to enrich foreign monopoly firms and individuals must be replaced by systematic planning and development whereby in the first place the Africans themselves shall be the principal beneficiaries of the wealth produced, then an equal opportunity shall be afforded to all nations in the exchange of products. In this regard an international council representative of producer and consumer interests should be established within the framework of the International Organisation for the stabilisation of commodity prices at levels ensuring reasonable returns to producers and maximum satisfaction to consumers.

(4) Simultaneously with economic development progressive steps should be taken to associate Africans with the management of their own affairs with a view toward the achievement of full self-government within a definite time limit, as in the case of the Philippine Commonwealth.

(5) The eradication of mass illiteracy calls for energetic measures no less sustained than those which aim at the ending of poverty, disease and squalor. The greater the spread of education for both children and adults the greater will be the pace of advancement of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peoples as a whole. That it is possible to eradicate mass illiteracy within a short space of time is proved by the experience of Soviet Central Asia, where 20 years ago there was a very small percentage of literacy, but where now illiteracy has been practically abolished and universities flourish.

(6) The former Italian colonies now under military rule shall have the same treatment as the rest of the African territories and shall be given every assistance in development along with these other territories on the road to full self-government.

African peoples earned right to benefit by new concept.

We believe that the African peoples by their contribution in man-power and material resources in the war against fascism; by their service in Ethiopia, East Africa, the Western Desert, Italy and in the Battle of Germany; and by their service in Burma in the eastern war against Japan, have earned the right to expect that they shall benefit as a result of the new concept of international co-operation which has been acquired in the course of the grim ordeal of the war of liberation against fascism.

(Signed by)

HAROLD A. MOODY
GEORGE PADMORE,
K. A. CHUNCHIE,
J. S. ANNAN,
H. N. CRITCHLOW,
SAMSON MORRIS,
R. W. BEOKU-BETTS,
T. A. BANKOLE,
K. A. KORSAH,
J. A. GARBA-JAHUMPA.
C. B. CLARKE.

Book Reviews

A Textbook on Money

Money : its present and future by G. D. H. Cole (Cassell and Co., London, pp. 321, 15*s*).

PROFESSOR G. D. H. COLE has set out to use his gift for lucid exposition in producing a comprehensive textbook on what is often regarded as a mystifying, and somewhat magical, subject: a textbook designed "not for the specialist, but for the intelligent general reader." His intention is "to set forth the fundamental facts in language so clear that no intelligent person shall be left with an excuse for not understanding them." "I am writing," he says, "primarily neither for professional economists nor for professional financiers, but for laymen—including politicians, whose knowledge of monetary matters is apt to be very sketchy indeed"; and he very properly wants to reassure those who are "apt to be frightened about monetary problems, because at the first approach everything seems to be topsy-turvy" that there is nothing very mysterious about it all, and that, in fact, "money is not, for the most part, a particularly difficult subject."

From a description of the uses of money, the kinds of money and what determines its amount, he proceeds to describe the credit system and the gold standard and the behaviour of money in booms and slumps. From this he approaches the threshold of monetary policy, and current controversies about it, and gives a detailed description of how savings and investment take place and their effects, and of the measures by which investment is and could be controlled and measures by which consumption (and hence demand for commodities) could be increased (e.g., by redistributing income by progressive taxation and social services). The Bank of England, the Exchange Equalisation Fund, and exchange control, Treasury Bills and their growing importance in the Money Market in recent years, the merchant bankers, issuing houses, investment trusts, all pass under review; and a separate chapter is devoted to the question: "Should the Banks be Socialised?" (needless to say, the author answers this question in the affirmative, and gives cogent reasons which are deserving of study by all). After a chapter on "The Investment of Long-Term Capital," the author comes, in conclusion, to international monetary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relations; and in these later chapters there is more discussion of matters of current policy, such as the Keynes and White currency plans, reparations and the future of international investment and the project of an international investment bank. Here description and explanation more frequently give place to exposition of the author's own views—the book necessarily becomes, in his own words, "in some degree a tract." For example, he wants an international monetary agreement to leave room for governments to make bilateral agreements in the interests of national autonomy in financial and employment policy; and while he is in favour of making the Germans pay "reparations in kind" in "rebuilding the areas they have devastated or despoiled," he criticises Varga's calculations of the required reparations as impracticably high.

Like most of the author's work, this contains a great deal of useful information, lucidly and easily expounded. The book always shows us the *point* of any problem, and does not just describe technicalities and mechanisms for their own sake. But although it may seem ungrateful to stress this, the question inevitably presents itself as to whether, as a piece of popular exposition, this study is altogether a success. Parts of it are undoubtedly successful. But there are, I think, three reasons which prompt one to ask this question.

First, popular exposition must obviously abstract—its success must lie as much in what it leaves out as in what it includes. Professor Cole, in this book, has evidently found it difficult to select; and the book is so packed with information about so many aspects of the subject, and so many variations of each theme, as to be rather bewildering for the lay reader, as well as somewhat laborious to wade through. The book, I suggest, would have gained from selection and condensation — from more thorough straining through a finer sieve. A picture of essentials would then have more readily implanted itself on the mind of the reader.

Secondly (as some reviewers have already noted) the theory of money the author expounds is a somewhat eclectic blend, which may well have a confusing effect, especially on the newcomer to the subject. He starts by expounding the Quantity Theory of Money in its traditional form and asking how much money is needed to finance *transactions*, which leads him to suggest on pages 62-3 that unemployment is primarily a result of a deficient supply of money ("if the means of payment are deficient, unemployment, under the capitalist system, will inevitably arise") and on page 143 to imply, apparently, that any issue of "new money" must cause "a tendency for prices to rise," even if there is unemployment and unused capacity. From this starting-point, however, he proceeds to the emphasis which has become current in the last five or six years, and which gives money rather a back seat as a determinant of either prices or employment, making the latter dependent on the amount of expenditure taking place (investment, whether governmental or private, *plus* consumption).

Thirdly, it is almost inevitable, perhaps, that, if one sets out to write a textbook exclusively about money, the impression is created that money and monetary policy are much more important, as causal elements, than they really are. This impression results from the very way in which some things are thrown into relief and others into shadow. The circulation-process, not the social relations of production, stand in the front of the picture. This is not Professor Cole's intention; but I rather feel that it is, nevertheless, the upshot of reading his book. He is, indeed, himself aware of this danger; for he starts by denying that "the world's economic troubles between 1918 and 1939 were mainly due to monetary disturbances or even to bad monetary policies," although the latter aggravated those troubles. "Money itself creates nothing: it is the lubricant of real economic processes of production and distribution."

But, though one may doubt the success of this popularisation, there is plenty in this book of importance and interest, cogently presented, to make the reading of it well worth the effort.

M. H. DOBB.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scotland

Gaelic in Scottish Education and Life. Past, Present and Future, by John Lorne Campbell of Canna (published for the Saltire Society by W. and A. K. Johnston Ltd., 3*s*6*d*, 106 pp.).

Scotland by Ian Finlay (Oxford University Press, 3*s*6*d*, 136 pp.).

A People's Plan for Scotland (Scottish Communist Party, 3*d*, 16 pp.).

IAN FINLAY has written a small but interesting book with the very ambitious title "Scotland." He deprecates, rightly, the romanticism that has caused so much misunderstanding of Scottish needs and Scottish problems. But he is inclined to indulge in a species of romanticism himself, especially when he talks about the "Kirk." The "Kirk" was the ideological weapon for carrying on the fight against the peasant activities by the Highlands, and for firmly establishing the rule of the new, industrial bourgeoisie. Supplementing the "Kirk" in this was "The Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian knowledge." Here is an excerpt from a "Memorial" of this Society quoted from *Gaelic in Scottish Education and Life*:—

> "Nothing can be more effectuall for reducing these countries (i.e., the Highlands and Islands) to order and making them usefull to the Commonwealth than teaching them their duty to God, their King and Countrey (*sic*), and rooting out their Irish language, and this has been the care of the Society so far as they could, for all the schollars are taught in English, and none are allowed to be masters of the Societie's Charitie Schools, but such as produce sufficient certificats of their piety, knowledge and loyalty."*

In presenting "The Problem Today," as he does in Chapter 6, Ian Finlay only touches the edge of the question. There is nothing about nationalisation of coal, and how to retain the heavy industries, of new roads, bridges, piers and ferries with light industries for the Highlands, very little or nothing.

On the cultural questions he presents C. M. Grieve ("Hugh McDiarmid") as "one of the most vital and powerful poets of today; a merciless enemy of all that is false and a tireless champion of what is genuine in Scottish culture."

Very good. But then Ian Finlay goes on to give a good word to the Citizens' Theatre and hopes it will advance. But this is one of the ventures that has come under the lash of C. M. Grieve, "a merciless enemy of all that is false." Ian Finlay had better get himself straightened out and when he does so, he might take note that "John Barke" should be James Barke, whose *Land of the Leal* is a Scottish classic.

In contrast, the pamphlet of the Scottish Communists is factual from start to finish and gives many details of what is the existing situation as well as a detailed plan for the immediate future.

WILLIAM GALLACHER.

Co-operative Evangelist-Critic

A Century of Rochdale Co-operation by Alderman Joseph Reeves (Lawrence & Wishart, 7*s*6*d*).

Soviet Co-operation; Official Report of the British Delegation to the U.S.S.R., 1944 (Co-operative Union Ltd., 1*s*)

A COMBINATION OF the role of evangelist and critic is most difficult, but somehow or another Joseph Reeves manages it. He believes that the Co-operative movement is important and that it has a far-reaching part to play in the struggle against capitalism; he recognises the diversity of forms the movement has taken according to the economic background of the country in which it is operating, but most definitely does he want to arrange all the parts of the British movement from a jig-saw complexity to a nice orderly, easily understandable, constitution.

He prefers the democratic method, but wants Parliament to give power to Congress to force the democrats to do what, up to the moment, they have shown little inclination to do. And, of course, he is correct.

All that is required is an Act conferring powers of government on Congress and making its decisions obligatory. There are examples in probably the Church Assembly, the Central Electricity Board and other economic forms. Granted such authority, Congress would settle the other

* S.P.C.K. General Meeting Minutes for June 2, 1716.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions and probably reject the simple solution the author offers to the myriad small societies.

You cannot achieve economic sanity by counting heads, and many an efficient retail society can operate with less than 50,000 members, carrying out other services by national and district federal organisations. The economic size of a society is dictated by the size of city, town or square miles of rural area, as much as by the number of people living in the area.

The first step is the unification of the C.W.S. and the Co-operative Union thereby giving the economic side sectional machinery. Much good could flow from this change.

Who is going to authorise whom to seek the changes in the Industrial and Provident Societies Acts which Joseph Reeves so ardently desires? We obviously want more evangelists and certainly, within the movement, more practical thinkers.

Only occasionally does this evangelist come to blows with this critic as when (on p. 8) he says that consumers' co-operation is a part of capitalist society and (on p. 111) the aims of the Soviet State are identical with those of the Co-operative movement! The Co-operative movement is no more a part of capitalist society than is the Communist Party! But generally, and in a forthright manner, Joseph Reeves carries on the good work in this compact analysis of the Co-operative movement. Here is no dull set of statistics or appendix of charts, but a survey of the kaleidoscope we know as the Co-operative movement. It has many a potent (if not poignant) sally at things as they are.

The three chapters included in Part IV contain far-reaching views and proposals which, though little is new, must continue to be re-stated, re-argued and re-assessed if the movement is to face the problems of the second century.

It is all eminently readable and the reader can be assured that the facts are correct, although on p. 202 a name is spelt incorrectly! and it would have been happier if this survey could have contained some reference to the gigantic part the British movement has played in the war effort.

The author is at his best when he gives us the benefit of the vast store of knowledge he has derived from his experience on the educational, political and sociological field. Here there is much study and understanding. This book proves, if nothing else, the need for an enlightened and educated membership and, it can be inferred from all that is written here, that if this movement can gain the economic support of nine million members in Britain it has so far failed educationally if only 5 per cent. of those members participate in its elections and business meetings.

Where is the magic touch which can transform this mass into an inspired and an informed movement? Joseph Reeves is as much concerned to deal with that question as he is to deal with changes in administration. He recognises the significance of Wembley Pageant (although tribute is due to other societies in addition to London Society) and to the resulting inspiration lamentably halted by the war. The political work of the movement is also correctly appraised and he gives his most significant pointer to future development in this field when he states his agreement with James Middleton, who, in his valedictory address, expressed a desire to see the strengthening and development of the National Council of Labour.

Much of the book is devoted, very ably, to a survey of the movement abroad and this section deserves a wide audience because the facts recorded contain much which is hopeful for the future. His views on the work of the international movement suffer from a lack of knowledge of the work of the International Co-operative Trading Agency, although his conclusions do not suffer materially by this omission.

This is primarily a book for co-operators and students and, as such, is an admirable treatise. It may do much to remedy the fact, which the author discovered long ago and here records, that the majority of socialists have never appreciated the economic significance of the movement.

The Report of the Delegation to the U.S.S.R., 1944, will do something to bring up to date the knowledge in this country of the work achieved by the Co-operatives in the U.S.S.R. It is a sympathetic appreciation, full of figures and information gathered by the goodwill mission consisting of Co-operative Union and Wholesale Society representatives.

R. G. GOSLING.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism a Guide to Action

Marxism and Modern Idealism by John Lewis, B.Sc., Ph.D. (Lawrence and Wishart, 1s).

DR. LEWIS does not confine himself to analysing and refuting idealism in general terms. His mastery of the subject is such that he can do this adequately and completely and still leave himself ample space in which to cite and dispose of all the chief examples of modern Idealism—"chief" in the sense that they are the ones most likely to do mischief with the common man.

In addition, he is able to give his work a practical application of front rank importance. He is able to show the direct connection between fascism and the anti-rationalism and irrationalism fostered by the chief trends in modern idealism.

It would be invidious and misleading to quote any passage or passages as samples. The essay is a complete and completed whole, and must be read and studied as such to be fully appreciated. As it stands it constitutes very nearly, if not quite, the best introduction to the study of the Marxian Dialectic available at present, or likely to be available.

One point only can be stressed here in support of the general thesis expounded in this work. Marx and Engels, in their historic *Communist Manifesto*, stress the point that as the bourgeois order moves towards its culminating crisis and the forces of revolutionary struggle begin to reveal their profundity and immensity the "weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism are turned against itself.

It is an historical truth of the first magnitude that among these weapons *theory*, in the form of sustained and systematically critical *reasoning* upon the basic assumptions, the customary beliefs, and the established institutions of society, played a part of front-rank importance. It is a commonplace, too, that the enthusiastic *rationalism* which accompanied and prepared the way for each successive crisis of the bourgeois revolution begot an enormous liberation of men's minds which had a decisive effect in cultural advance as well as in the world of practical affairs.

It is this weapon of *theory*—with all its cultural as well as practical concomitants—which is now turned against the irrationalism and anti-rationalism in which decadent and malignant fascist counter-revolution finds expression. It is no accident that fascist spokesmen avow their desire to abolish every trace left by the Great French Revolution; that they build, in defiance of reason, upon barbarous and brutal irrationalism, such as the notion of fixed and immutable "races"; that they exalt "thinking with the blood" above the use of brains and of reasoning; that talk of culture makes them "reach for their automatic pistols."

Marxism, as Marx and Engels said, and as John Lewis so admirably shows, is "no dogma, but a guide to action." These symptoms, exhibited by bestial counter-revolution, reveal in deeds what dialectical materialism reveals in its critical analysis—that the Liberation War of Humanity, the war for the annihilation of counter-revolution, in which the militant working-class are playing, and must play a decisive role, is also a war to preserve intact the cultural heritage of mankind and with it all its vast emergent possibilities for future advance.

John Lewis's pamphlet simply must be read and pondered by every militant. It really *guides* to action.

T. A. JACKSON.

Shorter Notice

Stalin and Eternal Russia by W. Kolarz (*Lindsay Drummond*, 6s, 144 pp.).

IT IS a pity that a reputable firm of publishers is responsible for this paltry attempt to "explain" the Soviet Union. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is described as "a new Party with an ideology which has no part in Bolshevism, but in Soviet patriotism." The author, however, does not insist on being original: and old familiar myths, such as Stalin's "absolutism" duly reappear.

The "Communists of Western Europe" are heartily disliked by the author, but are not quoted. On the other hand, Ustryalov (described by Lenin as an "open class enemy") is quoted with unction. And so it goes on, ancient and fish-like.

P.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from page ii. of cover*)

"The real meaning of Teheran, Yalta, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks, has been made clear to me by studying LABOUR MONTHLY carefully. Hence my eagerness to assist you financially.

"I want to return and join your ranks. My grocer comrade will not be there, though—he died fighting fascism in the Rhineland a week or so ago. He is gone, but I will take his place, remembering all he taught me.

"My very best wishes to you all."

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in April, 1945 : £74 : 8 : 9

	£	s.	d.
K.M.G., Ex-Rhodesia		2	6
G. Parsons		10	0
G. K.		7	0
D. H. Strathern and Friends		10	0
E. Lawson		2	6
J. Trott		6	0
I. Bywaters		5	0
E. Beck		10	0
T. Bromley	1	6	0
Forces, per D. A. H.	1	0	0
H. Williams		18	0
J. Purton	1	0	0
A. E., R.A.O.C.		10	0
R. Mecredy		10	0
S. Pedley		4	0
P. Neilson		2	0
V. Piper		1	6
H. Rider		3	0
Socialist Soldier		10	0
K. Lewen		5	0
E. Stout		5	0
J. Burnip		10	0
L. Broome		3	0
J. Hinchcliffe		1	0
G. C. Hodges		12	0
W. J. Potter		3	0
I. Wilson		3	0
J. Leader	1	0	0
E. Stiff		2	6
Old Age Pensioner		2	6
D. Rees		10	0
H. Berliner		2	0
N. Cohen		12	0
G. Robson		5	0
J. Turner		4	0
A. Israel		6	0
E. M. Thomas		6	0
C. Roberts		3	6
S. Mill		10	0
Eric and Norah		10	0
P. Andrews	1	0	0
K. B. Kay		5	0
A. Henderson	1	1	0
E. McCallum		5	0
D. Gardner		2	0
I. Martin		5	0
Colwyn Bay D.G.		6	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
F. A. Hargreaves		3	6
H. Whiteley		3	0
Three B.L.A. R.E.M.Es.	1	0	0
Lower Morden D.G.		4	0
W. Burbridge		2	6
N. Kelly		10	0
Vigilant—R.A.F.		12	9
H. A. B.	5	0	0
Q. Z.		12	0
E. Cremers		2	0
S. Gray		1	0
J. B.		5	0
S. H. Harris		8	0
D. Calcutt		3	0
D. Oakeshott		5	0
M. Mertens		1	6
K. Rintoul		13	0
J. Ruddock		14	0
Learner		2	0
Cedar	10	0	0
R. Hart		10	0
J. A. Smith		2	6
Anon, Whitchurch		1	0
J. Pack		2	6
D. Welsh		1	0
J. Walter		3	0
R. Sleep		5	0
D. W. Smith		3	0
D. R. Dawe		13	0
Eric and Norah		13	0
D. L. Evans		3	0
A. Exten		13	0
L. H. Luery		13	0
R. C. Pratt		1	6
Airmen		2	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
Director	2	0	0
Progressive Airman		5	0
B. Brain		3	0
F. Stehr		5	0
V.A.D.		5	0
S. Craven		13	0
W. Maddison	1	0	0
E. Reckitt	1	0	0
Dr. Barrow		13	0
J. Keith		3	0
L. Holton		1	6
R. M. L.		7	6
G. Robson		5	0
R. Stevenson		5	0
D. Palmer		10	0
G. Harrison	1	10	0
A. W. M.		13	0
H. Williams	1	0	0
A. Hickton		2	6
Sedgley D.G.		7	0
Herts Sympathiser		10	0
R. Anderson		7	6
G. Morey		10	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
S. Clegg		10	0
The Bacon Family		6	0
P. Vaughan			6
Anon, Haslemere		5	0
R. E. Evans		1	0
L'Humanite		4	6
E. McCallum		5	0
H. S. M.		2	6
Edinburgh D.G.		11	0
R. Pearson		2	6
J. Ellis		5	0
R. Green		3	0
D.G.10	1	17	0
Salud		5	0
J. Smith		2	6
S. Smart		3	0
R. D. Rees		13	0
F. A. L.		5	0
F. M. R.		10	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
R. F. B.	3	0	0
S. Bruss		2	0
A. Opulski		1	6
V. Smith	1	0	0
W. Burbridge		2	6
Supporter		2	0
W. Beards			6
W. St. G. Light		3	0
L. Bates		2	6
A. Wall		5	0
F. A. Mace		12	0
B. Edises		2	0
K. & G. Williams		10	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is to be done with Hitler and Hess and the other gangsters? This searching pamphlet, the only easily available source for the facts about the War Crimes Commission and the attitude of the governments, equips you to deal with this question.

WAR CRIMINALS

by

D. N. PRITT, K.C., M.P.

Price one shilling.

(POST FREE 1/1)

Obtainable everywhere, or direct from the Publishers —

LABOUR MONTHLY, 134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Ready in June

THE CIVIL SERVICE AND THE PEOPLE

R. W. Rawlings — 7s. 6d.

ON CAPITAL

Frederick Engels — *Reprint* 6s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PROOF COPY ONLY
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED